IT Project Evaluation

State of Iowa - Return on Investment Program / IT Project Evaluation

SECTION 1: PROPOSAL

Tracking Number (For Project Office Use)

Project Name: **DNR Online Electronic Permitting and Licenses** Date: **7-14-00**

Agency Point of Contact for Project: **J. Edward Brown**

Agency Point of Contact Phone Number / E-mail: **1-8926 jim.brown@dnr.state.ia.us**

Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee) Signature: **Lyle Asell, Interim Director**

Is this project necessary for compliance with a Federal standard, initiative, or statute? (If "Yes," cite specific requirement, attach copy of requirement, and explain in Proposal Summary)	❑ Yes
Is this project required by State statute? (If "Yes," explain in Proposal Summary)	❑ No
Does this project meet a health, safety or security requirement? (If "Yes," explain in Proposal Summary)	❑ No
Is this project necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard? (If "Yes," explain in Proposal Summary)	❑ No
Does this project contribute to meeting a strategic goal of government? (If "Yes," explain in Proposal Summary)	❑ Yes
Is this a "research and development" project? (If "Yes," explain in Proposal Summary)	❑ No

PROPOSAL SUMMARY:

In written detail, explain why the project is being undertaken and the results that are expected. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1. A pre-project (before implementation) and a post-project (after implementation) description of the system or process that will be impacted.

Response:

A. Pre-Project

Currently the department issues several thousand permits (i.e. air, land and water), and over 500,000 hunting and fishing licenses per year, for a wide range of program areas. Environmental permits include about 1,800 permits to discharge wastewater, 300 federally mandated large scale air quality permits and nearly 5,000 permits for permits to construct facilities or structures related to air or water pollution control. Collectively, permits issued by the DNR regulate virtually every municipality and industry in the state.

Issuance is automated to varying degrees or not automated at all. In some cases manual intervention and paper handling is required, which can be time consuming and a source of frustration, especially for the customer. The feasibility study must take into consideration: differing system components, differing platforms, equipment

components, software and hardware compatibility issues, application development coordination and interface requirements as well as connectivity issues.

Natural resource related statutes and environmental laws, in particular, have evolved and are ever changing. While most of the DNR's automated systems work well independently, DNR 's interest in a holistic approach allows for evaluation of information on an enterprise scale and automation of manual processes. As well it positions the department to provide better access of information by the customer through electronic means (i.e. electronic commerce). DNR will benefit from options identified for achieving enterprise objectives. This proposed study is the most practical way to allow the department complete this analysis and select a cost-effective option for the future.

B. Post-Project

DNR's intention is to take an enterprise approach to its electronic permitting and licensing. The enterprise approach will require a comprehensive feasibility study for the Department. DNR's methodology will be a phased approach. The first phase will encompass a feasibility study for enterprise electronic permitting and licensing, resulting in the framework to enable the development and implementation of a comprehensive system. This project will cover the acquisition of consulting services to study current processes, to research enterprise permitting and licensing projects utilized by other states, evaluate various options and recommend a comprehensive implementation strategy for the Department to pursue.

2. A summary of the extent to which the project provides tangible and intangible benefits to either Iowa citizens or to State government. Included would be such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, complying with enterprise technology standards, meeting a strategic goal, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, complying with federal or state laws, etc.

Response:

A. Phase One:

The tangible benefit of the first phase will be documented processes, which identify to a degree the current "hassle factor" experienced by the DNR, state and local government as well as the public and private sector. Also, it will provide options for improving work processes that meet strategic goals, such as online access to information.

With the research and documentation from the study, and the contractor's recommendations on options that will support enterprise online permitting and licensing, the department will be in a much better position to explore and pursue additional funding opportunities. Currently, federal funding alone limits the scope of our endeavor to environmental permitting.

1. This study will increase the odds for the availability grants, which are targeted to facilitate multimedia efforts, and improve electronic availability of government services and interfaces between the state and federal programs through improved federal reporting systems.

2. Leveraging both federal and state funding will enable DNR to increase the project scope for the electronic permitting and licensing.

3. This project will result in more comprehensive and seamless, department-wide processes, with better reporting and tracking mechanisms, improved data sharing as well as access by the public across program areas. These improvements will translate into better service for our customers.

B. Phase Two. (Not included in this ROI, but identified for better understanding of the DNR request and how this ROI will move us toward the goals of the Governor and DNR for electronic permitting and licensing)

1. After a decision is made on the options presented in the feasibility study, the next phase will be the actual design, development and implementation of a uniform, comprehensive, yet flexible system, which encompasses the various permits and licensing types under the regulatory purview of the agency. The study will lead to the second phase of the project, which may ultimately result in the following benefits which include: enhanced funding opportunities, improved processes, reduction in risk to health/safety, meeting of strategic goals, etc.

- **Electronic permitting and licensing for DNR programs**
  - Improved work processes through the innovative development, deployment and utilization of automation.
  - Better data accuracy, data management and data collection.
  - Improved public access to data (i.e. Internet access to allow status checks of permits and licenses by applicants; supplying a source of information during spills or accidental releases, etc.).
  - Improved consistency and access to information among field offices to permitting and licensing data.
  - Automated programs for applicants/engineers/scientists/consultants to determine air dispersion modeling, mixing zones, and floor profile elevations.
  - Streamlined data entry. Reduction in data entry errors or inconsistencies through system edits.
  - Electronic reporting and filing.
  - Coordination of data with other program areas.
  - Online systems containing answers to common questions; guiding the public through processes, leaving personnel free to finalize issuance, to answer personalized questions and conduct outreach and assistance; increased and more focused enforcement activities.
  - Reduction and/or elimination of bureaucratic paper pushing.
  - Cost reduction via time saved in manually filling out complex forms.
    - When the Iowa Access project for Air Quality permitting was started it was estimated that the industries needing permits would save around $6.00 for every dollar spent on that project. Similar savings should be expected for phase 2 of this project.
  - Cost savings in a reduction of the need to print, or order and ship, paper forms.
  - Storage space savings.
  - Reduction in public health concerns through communication and availability of information. (i.e. enhance our ability to reassure the public that state programs are protective of water quality for safe swimming and water supply).
  - The reduction of the backlog of expired permits and licenses.
  - Meet the federal statute requiring social security number on hunting and fishing licenses so that the information can be provided to the Department of Human services for Collection of Child Support activities.
  - The EPA's goal of One Stop Reporting could be achieved through this initiative.
  - Governor Vilsack's agenda of using technology to streamline government and make information accessible to all Iowans will be achieved to a greater extent.
  - Fulfilling the legislative requirement for digital access to government.
- The enterprise system could serve as a model for other departments and other states to adopt.

3. A summary that identifies the project stakeholders and how they are impacted by the project.

Response:

The first phase of the project will identify various options for electronic permitting and licensing activities performed by DNR and the feasibility of those options. The stakeholders affected will be DNR employees as well as management, and program administrators. The results of the first phase of the project will impact those stakeholders by enabling data based decision-making supported through research and recommendations of the study. It will also introduce a more objective view of processes and present options that may not have been contemplated by those internal to DNR.

The second phase will result in a greater impact to stakeholders as outlined below.

A. Taxpayers—more efficiency through improved services and processes, less paperwork and better access to data and more timely and accurate information. Savings of taxpayer dollars through more efficient use of the data we now have.

B. State Government Customers—(public, issuing agents, consultants, contractors, other agencies that utilize DNR information or partner to provide services). See A above.

C. Federal, State, and Local Government Programs and Operations:

- State--improved decision making, strategic planning and information sharing.
- County recorders— improved processes for issuing permits/licenses, the vendors
- Enforcement agencies— improved access to information and providing updated information to our data bases
- Federal—better position to meeting reporting requirements more uniform and timely manner. See benefits above.
- Legislature—meet the directive of facilitating public's need for digital access to government improved operational efficiency and effectiveness of governmental operations.

D. Private Sector Vendors—improved processes for issuing/obtaining licenses and permits, less paperwork, better access to data, more timely and accurate data and information, more consistency across programs.

SECTION 2: PROJECT PLAN

Individual project plans will vary depending upon the size and complexity of the project. A project plan includes the following information:

1. Agency Information

Project Executive Sponsor Responsibilities: Identify, in Section I, the executive who is the sponsor of the project. The sponsor must have the authority to ensure that adequate resources are available for the entire project, that there is commitment and support for the project, and that the organization will achieve successful project implementation.

Response:

See Section 1.

Organization Skills: Identify the skills that are necessary for successful project implementation. Identify which of these skills are available within the agency and the source(s) and acquisition plan for the skills that are lacking.

Response:

A. Project Sponsor--skills available within the agency
B. Project Manager—skills available within the agency
C. Project Oversight Steering Committee—skills available within the agency
D. Vendor Project Lead—consultant needed, funding from this ROI will enable acquisition.
E. Information Technology hardware/software data knowledge—skills available within agency
F. Program involvement and knowledge of processes—skills available within agency
G. Experienced research and needs assessment skills in conducting feasibility studies— professional consulting services needed—funding from this ROI will enable acquisition.
H. IT experience on various platforms and in use of software—coordinated effort with vendor and DNR IT staff provided—funding from this ROI will enable acquisition of vendor services.

2. Project Information

Mission, Goals, Objectives: The project plan should clearly demonstrate that the project has developed from an idea to a detailed plan of action. The project plan must link the project to an agency's mission, goals, and objectives and define project objectives and how they will be reached. The project plan should include the following:

A. **Expectations**: A description of the purpose or reason that the effort is being undertaken and the results that are anticipated.

Response:

For a number of reasons, the DNR is faced with the prospect of no substantial increase in resources while expectations are increasing. For example, the Congress, EPA, and the Legislature are calling for new programs and projects. At the same time the public demands more information about the department's actions such as permitting, expecting almost real time assessments of the State of Iowa's natural resources.

The expectation is a comprehensive feasibility study for enterprise electronic permitting and licensing, resulting in the framework to enable the development and implementation of a department-wide automated

permitting and licensing function. The department-wide process will result in more efficient and defined processing procedures, increase user satisfaction and decrease cost and time for both the applicant and state.

B. **Measures**: A description of the set of beliefs, tradeoffs and philosophies that govern the results of the project and their attainment. How is the project to be judged or valued? What criteria will be used to determine if the project is successful? What happens if the project fails?

Response:

Beliefs, tradeoffs & philosophies: DNR management supports improved processes for the permits and licensing functions of the agency. The statutory responsibilities of DNR involve broad and interwoven programs, many of which overlap with the responsibilities of federal and other state agencies, local governments and the private sector. Our newly adopted mission statement recognizes the department's role in leading citizens toward common goals, which relies more and more on collaborative efforts. Building and maintaining effective partnerships and coalitions are essential in achieving the appropriate levels of commitment and support to manage, protect, conserve, develop and understand Iowa's natural resources. The results of this project should move the Department one step closer to maintaining and improving those partnerships. As well it sets the stage for continuing to develop an "environmental ethic" through improved services that change the focus to DNR issues, and re-direct staff from paperwork to support issuance activities, answering personalized questions, conducting outreach and assistance, and focusing on enforcement activities.

Success factors include: Identification and documentation of the processes currently in place for licensing and permits, identification and documentation of obvious areas for improvement, feasibility and high level cost of various options as well as a recommendation on how to move to the next phase in the project.

If the project fails, DNR is still able to provide services to its customers at the same level it does currently.

C. **Environment:** Who will provide input (e.g., businesses, other agencies, citizens) into the development of the solution? Are others creating similar or related projects? Are there cooperation opportunities?

Response:

The product of this project will tell us what other states are doing, what success and failures they have experienced so that DNR can learn from others mistakes, prior to moving to the next phase (Phase 2). Cooperation opportunities lie in the possibility of systems being identified that could be copied and put in place here at DNR and shared experiences.

Additionally, input will be received from agency program and IT personnel as well as the public and private sector. Most of the information is available here at DNR and from other states, which have engaged in similar activities. It is possible that there may be some vendors who have system methodology experts in automated permitting and licensing, which may also be contacted to provide input.

Regarding similar or related projects, currently, we are not aware of any other initiatives with the types of licenses and permits utilized by DNR and this study will provide that information.

D. **Project Management and Risk Mitigation**: A description of how you plan to manage the project budget, project scope, vendors, contracts and business process change (if applicable). Describe how you plan to mitigate project risk.

Response:

The Project Sponsor with input and oversight from the Steering Committee will manage the project. A project plan will be established and monitored to ensure that milestones are met, obstacles and resolutions are identified and appropriate action taken. The budget will be maintained and monitored by the Project Manager

(DNR). Vendor and agency project expectations will be carefully scoped and will be monitored by the DNR Project Manager to ensure it is working within budget, meeting established and agreed upon time frames and providing expected deliverables. Changes will be handled through a formal process and approved based upon changes to the timeline, budget and impact to processes. Project risk will be identified up front as much as feasible and a proactive approach to reducing that risk taken. Consistent status reporting requirements and regular project team meetings will ensure effective communications.

E. **Security / Data Integrity / Data Accuracy / Information Privacy**: A description of the security requirements of the project? How will these requirements be integrated into the project and tested. What measures will be taken to insure data integrity, data accuracy and information privacy?

Response:

As with all contracts, the vendor will be required to sign a confidentiality statement and adhere to the guidelines for working with this data, as there some data of confidential nature may be accessed. The vendor's access to systems will be limited to that necessary to produce the deliverables.

3. Current Technology Environment (Describe the following):

A. Software (Client Side / Server Side / Midrange / Mainframe)

- Application software
- Operating system software
- Interfaces to other systems: Identify important or major interfaces to internal and external systems

Response:

A variety of Platforms are used at DNR. Most uses and users are represented by the first one (General Computing Environment and Local Databases) listed immediately below. The remaining keys represent specialized systems as follows:

1. General Computing Environment and Local Databases
2. SPARS and other Air Quality Systems
3. ELSI
4. SDWIS (Client Server)
5. NPDES and other Mainframe Systems

Application Software			
Client Side	**Server Side**	**Midrange**	**Mainframe**
Paradox (1.)	ORACLE (2,4)		IDMS (5)
ACCESS (1)	ZenWorks (1)		COBOL (5)
ArcInfo, Arcview GIS (1)	Groupwise (1)		
Microsoft Office 97 (1)	Windows SQL Server (3)		
Groupwise Client (1)			
Powerbuilder (2)			
Operating System software			
Client Side	**Server Side**	**Midrange**	**Mainframe**
Win 95, 98, NT	Netware 4.11 (1,4)	UNIX (2)	OS390 (5)

	UNIX (2)		
	Windows NT/Windows 2000 (3)		
Interfaces to systems include other agencies, such as DOT and DHS and federal reporting			

B. Hardware (Client Side / Server Side / Mid-range / Mainframe):

- Platform, operating system, storage and physical environmental requirements.
- Connectivity and Bandwidth: If applicable, describe logical and physical connectivity.
- Interfaces to other systems: Identify important or major interfaces to internal and external systems.

Response:

Hardware Platforms			
Client Side	**Server Side**	**Mid-Range**	**Mainframe**
User workstations: PC Compatibles 100Mhz Pentium or better (1,2,3,4,5)	Compaq Proliant 3000 300Mhz or better (1,3,4)	HP 9000, Sun Ultra and Netra computers Cygnet Jukebox (Optical storage) (2)	Mainframe at ITD, Hoover Building "B" level. (5)
	Operating Environment, Storage and Physical Requirements		
	Secure temperature-controlled environment. Up to 500GB data storage	Secure temperature-controlled environment. **<Additional detail needed here from AQ>**	N.A. (Provided by ITD)
Bandwidth			
100mbps @ Wallace Building; 10mbps to Ingram Bldg and Iowa City; T1 to six state regional offices; modem connections elsewhere.			

4. Proposed Environment (Describe the following):

A. Software (Client Side / Server side / Mid-range / Mainframe)

- Application software.
- Operating system software.
- Interfaces to other systems: Identify important or major interfaces to internal and external systems.
- General parameters if specific parameters are unknown or to be determined.

Response:

It is anticipated that the feasibility study will recommend the proposed environment and consideration given to leveraging what is in place.

B. Hardware (Client Side / Server Side / Mid-range / Mainframe)

- Platform, operating system, storage and physical environmental requirements.
- Connectivity and Bandwidth: If applicable, describe logical and physical connectivity.

- Interfaces to other systems: Identify important or major interfaces to internal and external systems.
- General parameters if specific parameters are unknown or to be determined.

Response:

It is anticipated that the feasibility study will recommend the proposed environment and consideration given to leveraging what is in place.

Data Elements: If the project creates a new database the project plan should include the specific software involved and a general description of the data elements.

Response:

To be determined, in phase 2.

Project Schedule: A schedule that includes: time lines, resources, tasks, checkpoints, deliverables and responsible parties.

Response:

The goal is for the project to be started in September and completed by May 30, 2000. The timeframe for the feasibility study to be completed is within the current fiscal year. During this time an RFP will be written and bids taken, vendor chosen, the study completed, recommendations presented, required legislative changes made if necessary.

The anticipated starting date of Phase 2 would July 1, 2001. Prior to July 1 the RFP for the second Phase would also be written, bids taken, a vendor chosen, and funding sources identified, etc.

SECTION 3: Return On Investment (ROI) Financial Analysis

Project Budget:

Provide the estimated project cost by expense category.

Personnel	$ 8,000
Software	$ 1,500
Hardware	$ 0
Training	$ 0
Facilities	$ 3,000
Professional Services	$350,000*
Supplies	$ 5,000
Other (Specify)……	$ 15,000 (travel)
Total	$382,500

*IBM was consulted for an estimation of costs. They've indicated this scope of this project was different than the professional licensing assessment done by them for the State of Iowa. DNR's assessment will require the information to be gathered through meetings with various individuals and entities. Apparently the information for the professional licensing was already gathered through surveys. IBM indicated options on the "to be" environment would require an additional "architect" skill level. As well, DNR consulted with its Environmental counterparts at the State of New Jersey regarding their permitting project for that state and was informed that their feasibility study cost was $500,000. The estimate above is a middle range cost of the two cost estimates. Unfortunately, this guess estimation is the best information that can be arrived at without issuing an RFP and receiving quoted bids.

Project Funding:

Provide the estimated project cost by funding source.

State Funds	$382,500	_____100	% of total cost
Federal Funds	$0	_____	% of total cost
Local Gov. Funds	$0	_____	% of total cost
Private Funds	$0	_____	% of total cost
Other Funds (Specify)	$0	_____	% of total cost
Total Cost:	$382,500	_____100	% of total cost

How much of the cost would be incurred by your agency
from normal operating budgets (staff, equipment, etc.)? $0 ..... 0%

How much of the cost would be paid by "requested IT project funding"? $382,500 100%

Provide the estimated project cost by fiscal year: FY__01___ $382,500

FY_____ $_____

FY_____ $_____

Note:

DNR understands that its proposed project of "online environmental permitting" was one project identified for pooled technology funding in the past legislative session under Senate File 2433. The $1,000,000 figure was an estimate for online Water Quality permitting design, development, and implementation in itself. The approach has expanded into two phases.

DNR's approach for an enterprise effort, rather than looking at each permitting and licensing process individually will result in more comprehensive and seamless, department-wide processes, with better reporting and tracking mechanisms, improved data sharing as well as access by the public across program areas. This ROI vision goes beyond the environmental permitting aspect only.

Additional funding will be needed in FY02 and FY3 in order to build (design, develop, test and implement) the enterprise electronic permitting and licensing system for DNR. The cost for each of these years is estimated to range from $1,000,000 to $7,000,000. It is difficult at this time to estimate the costs without the completion of the feasibility study, but for budget projection purposes we would take the average of $3,500,000 for costs over the next two fiscal years. Again, once the feasibility study is available, the DNR will be in a better position to estimate future project costs.

The $1,000,000 to $7,000,000 estimate for the design, development and implementation phase was obtained through preliminary information sharing with the states of Ohio, New Jersey and Pennsylvania that have digitized a ***portion*** of their permitting or licensing systems. DNR has been unable to locate a state who has done a comprehensive enterprise approach such as we are proposing. ***This may be a first in the nation effort.***

In addition, DNR requested a ball park estimate from a vendor working with the Air Quality for adding one facet of permits, to an existing system. The cost of adding the single component was approximated at $1,000,000. Therefore, the estimate of $3,500,000 per fiscal year may be lower than the actual costs that may be incurred.

It is expected that DNR will receive various options and cost estimates for Phase Two. One option that might be presented in the feasibility study is an incremental implementation strategy. Another option might be to do the project in one large component and a pilot or prototype might be offered. It is very likely that this project will span 2 or 3 years before implementation is complete.

ROI Financial Worksheet Directions (Attach Written Detail as Requested):

Annual Pre-Project Cost -- Quantify, in written detail, all actual State government direct and indirect costs (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation. This section should be completed only if State government costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation.

Response:

N/A—costs are not expected to be reduced as a result of Phase One.

Annual Post-Project Cost -- Quantify, in written detail, all estimated State government direct and indirect costs associated with activity, system or process after project implementation. This section should be completed only if State government costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation.

Response:

N/A—costs are not expected to be reduced as a result of Phase One.

State Government Benefit -- Subtract the total "Annual Post-Project Cost" from the total "Annual Pre-Project Cost." This section should be completed only if State government costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation.

Response:

N/A—costs are not expected to be reduced as a result of Phase One.

Citizen Benefit -- Quantify, in written detail, the estimated annual value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses (hidden taxes) related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on or waiting for the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses.

Response:

See Specific "citizen benefit" not quantifiable. Phase Two will have quantifiable benefits, but they are not identifiable in this phase.

Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance Benefit -- Quantify, in written detail, the estimated annual benefit to Iowa citizens or to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response:

N/A for Phase One

Total Annual Project Benefit -- Add the values of all annual benefit categories.

Response:

N/A for Phase One

Total Annual Project Cost -- Quantify, in written detail, the estimated annual new cost necessary to implement and maintain the project including consulting fees, equipment retirement, ongoing expenses (i.e. labor, etc.), other technology (hardware, software and development), and any other specifically identifiable project related expense. In general, to calculate the annual hardware cost, divide the hardware and associated costs by three (3), the useful life. In general, to calculate the annual software cost, divide the software and associated costs by four (4), the useful life. This may require assigning consulting fees to hardware cost or to software cost. A different useful life may be used if it can be documented.

Response:

N/A for Phase One.

Benefit / Cost Ratio – Divide the "Total Annual Project Benefit" by the "Total Annual Project Cost." If the resulting figure is greater than one (1.00), then the annual project benefits exceed the annual project cost. If the resulting figure is less than one (1.00), then the annual project benefits are less than the annual project cost.

Response:

N/A for Phase One

ROI -- Subtract the "Total Annual Project Cost" from the "Total Annual Project Benefit" and divide by the amount of the project funds requested.

Response:

See Section 3, Project Budget.

Benefits Not Cost Related or Quantifiable -- List the project benefits and articulate, in written detail, why they (IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.) are not cost related or quantifiable. Rate the importance of these benefits on a "1 – 10" basis, with "10" being of highest importance. Check the "Benefits Not Cost Related or Quantifiable" box in the applicable row.

Response:

See Section 1, Proposal Summary, Project Benefits 2A, 1-3.

1. Rating 10

2. Rating 10

3. Rating 10

4. Building and maintaining effective partnerships and coalitions are essential in achieving the appropriate levels of commitment and support to manage, protect, conserve, develop and understand Iowa's natural resources. The results of this project should move the Department one step closer to maintaining and improving those partnerships.

   Rating 10

5. Support of the "environmental ethic" through improved services that change the focus to DNR issues, and re-direct staff from paperwork to support issuance activities, answering personalized questions, conducting outreach and assistance, and focusing on enforcement activities.

   Rating 10

6. The completion of this study may lead to a model which other states or departments may use to streamline and improve permitting and licensing services. Duplication of efforts could be reduced.

   Rating 10

7. A completed list of options and recommendation for the plan of action as well as estimated costs of the next phase will facilitate management assessment of the total cost benefit picture as DNR plans for Phase 2, the design, development and implementation of a comprehensive permitting and licensing system.

   Rating 10

ROI Financial Worksheet

Annual Pre-Project Cost - How You Perform The Function(s) Now	
FTE Cost (salary plus benefits):	
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	
A. Total Annual Pre-Project Cost:	
Annual Post-Project Cost – How You Propose to Perform the Function(s)	
FTE Cost:	
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	
B. Total Annual Post-Project Cost:	
State Government Benefit (= A-B):	
Annual Benefit Summary	
State Government Benefit:	
Citizen Benefit (including quantifiable "hidden taxes"):	
Opportunity Value and Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit:	
C. Total Annual Project Benefit:	
D. Total Annual Project Cost:	
Benefit / Cost Ratio (C / D): **ROI (C – D / Project Funds Requested):**	
x Benefits Not Cost Related or Quantifiable (including non-quantifiable "hidden taxes")	